CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

VOL XXXI No. 11 *Registered at the G. P.O. as a Newspaper* Nov./Dec. 1980

HE MIGHT BE YOUR ANCESTOR, BUT HE IS CERTAINLY NOT ONE OF OURS!

SEE MARIE ENDEAN'S 'THE CASE FOR EVOLUTIONARY REVISIONISM', p.8

ALSO INSIDE:

Cut and Thrust by Robert Blake
Reflections on Rhodesia by 'British Volunteer'
Socialism Unmasked Pt. II by A. N. Field
Dynamic Inversions by B. E Biggs
Light and Bitter by JANUS

The Ideal Christmas gift for Patriots

'OPEN SESAME'

The strongest message in the fewest words

An anthology of the poems of B. E. Biggs

Available now for only £1 from Candour Publishing Co.

CUT AND THRUST

by ROBERT BLAKE

ARMING THE REDS. — Any Briton who still resolutely maintains that we have "dreamed a dream that could not be" in asserting that Russian industrial, technological and military development is crucially dependent on Western — principally American — aid must have their eyes closed hard to be able to ignore current estimates of the range and valuation of equipment and knowledge supplied to the Soviet Union. The techno'ogical hardware transferred over the past decade alone — ranging from engine assembly lines and chemical plants to oil-drilling equipment, computers and advanced space technology — is valued at 50 billion dollars. So ineffective are the standing rules of COCOM, the laughable co-ordinating committee set up to limit the export of strategic goods and know-how to the Communists, that the K.G.B. might as well close down its Science and Technology Directorate since Western technical secrets and vital equipment are being sold perfectly legally and with the approval of Western governments!

So far from such aid to the Russians being a relatively recent manifestation of Western policy, readers need little instruction on the nexus which has existed between New York and Moscow since 1917 — not, at least, if they know their Chesterton! Despite his scepticism about conspiracy, signal service to the cause of illuminating the dark recesses of twentieth-century history has been performed by Professor Sutton specifically in documenting the Western finance and technology to Russian economic development, thus shattering any notion that the Soviets have independently developed their now colossal war-machine. As he put it so bluntly in his testimony at the 1972 Republican Convention, "the U.S. and N.A.T.O. countries have built the Soviet Union's industrial and its military capabilities." How odd that U.P.I. and A.P., the major news agencies, refused to distribute his warning, when even then it was clear that this policy, if maintained, would pose the danger of Moscow eventually asserting strategic superiority over the West. Were they wishing away unpalatable news — or did a more sinister motive exist?

BLOWING THE LID OFF. — In the face of media reluctance to break the discreet curtain of censorship which has prevented the majority of the public learning the truth about the gigantic deals which the West has granted and continues to grant the Russians, it was heartening to read a devastatingly frank summary by the *Daily Telegraph's* Robert Moss (no friend of our nationalist cause) on September 8th of key areas in which Soviet military power has been built up from *outside* the Communist bloc. With due acknowledgement, I quote extracts from his article:

"Soviet success in eroding the qualitative lead in missile accuracy that the Americans held in 1972 . . . has been largely due to the purchase of 164 Ventalign-B machines from an American corporation. These machines manufacture miniature ball-bearings that are milled to exceptionally fine tolerances, enabling missiles to alter direction during flight, with vastly improved accuracy. They helped the Russians solve the problem of 'mirving' (i.e. installing multiple independently targetted re-entry vehicles) on their missiles.

"The entire Soviet computer system is copied from American technology. Russia's 'Ryad' family of computers are based on the I.B.M. 360s and 370s (which the K.G.B. acquired through an illegal 'switch around' arrangement without the knowledge of the parent company). But the jai'ed Soviet dissident Anatoly Shcharansky, formerly employed as a computer technician in the Russian military establishment, has borne witness to the extent to which computer technology, legally sold for supposedly 'civilian' purposes, has been diverted for military ends. The control and guidance systems of the Soviet Air Force . . . are based on American technology. So is the data retrieval system of the K.G.B."

CHASE MANHATTAN BANK. — We are all familiar with the part played by Tri-lateral Commission boss David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank in stumping up 192 million dollars, along with the American Export-Import Bank's 86½ million, to finance the Kama River mechanical complex. It is here, Mr. Moss reported, that lorries are produced in which Russia's mechanised infantry divisions ride into battle. United States co-operation, he says, "produced the production lines, the automatic foundry for making engines and the control computer for this gigantic plant, which is able to turn out 150,000 lorries a year (plus an additional 100,000 engines). The lorries from the Kama complex have a 60 per cent. greater haulage capacity than those previously produced in the Soviet Union

"High-quality gun barrels are mass-produced in Russia thanks to West European expertise. One of the prime suppliers of precision rotary forging equip-

ment — for which the Russians have paid out some 500 million dollars over the past twenty years — is an Austrian company . . .

"In the coming battle in space the Russians will be able to profit from imported American know-how, including the technology for coupling space capsules and for manufacturing advanced space suits. Semi-conductor technology essential in the guidance systems of Soviet I.C.B.M.s and other missiles has been supplied by American and West European corporations. Even in the wake of President Carter's much-touted trade sanctions against Russia last January, the Commerce Department has approved a 144 million dollar contract for Dresser Industries to supply technology for the production of hardened drilling bits in the Soviet Union. This will permit the Russians to mass-produce more effective armour-piercing projectiles"

In concluding his disquieting article, the author detected the general trend in these dealings with the ostensible enemies of the West as confirming Lenin's cynical judgement that the capitalist will sell the rope with which he will be hung. True though that is, I prefer A. K. Chesterton's crack when Kruschev made his famous threat to bury the Western nations: "Tomorrow the 'planes will be hurtling towards Moscow with representatives of every capitalist manufacturer of excavators begging for the contract!" It is an idea that appears increasingly less fanciful as events unfold.

HAMMER AND SICKLE. — By strange coincidence, on the very day that Robert Moss' article appeared in the *Telegraph,* it carried an extensive report on Dr. Armand Hammer, whose Occidental Petroleum company had just announced a £625 million investment programme at Peterhead and Canvey Island. It is not these proposals so much as 'Doctor Occidental' himself who is of interest, for few men have wielded as much influence in the White House and the Kremlin simultaneously as this Russian-born Jewish entrepreneur, who was one of the principal pioneers in trade between America and the Soviet Union.

His ties with Russia, we read, began in 1921 when, on hearing about the epidemics and famine generated by the largely-Jewish Bolsheviks' overthrow of all civilised order, he bought a mobile hospital from U.S. Army surplus stock and set off to aid the Communists. Once there, he organised a million dollar consignment of American wheat in return for Russian furs, hides and caviar, and after a nine-year stay during which he engaged himself in a number of other lucrative ventures, left the Soviet Union loaded to the eye-teeth with Czarist treasures ranging from paintings and treasures to silver and jewels. He has maintained his paradoxical image of a capitalist doling out life-sustenance to his 'mortal foes' ever since, sponsoring a number of multi-million dollar deals designed to rescue the stagnant, inefficient and corruption-ridden economies of Communist states from collapse — deals, incidentally, which the American taxpayer has often had to foot via the Export-Import Bank.

Of course, Hammer denies sympathy for Communism is his motive. "I never believed their system would be as good as ours," he told the *Telegraph.* "Good" for what? Manipulating an economy for his own pecuniary advantage? But he is not just another greedy boy . . . for I am convinced I saw a cat slip out of his bag when we went on to remark: "We are becoming more socialistic and they (the Soviets) are becoming more capitalistic *and somewhere in between there is a meeting ground."* Hammer is one of that breed of super-rich for whom capitalism and communism are both converging means to an end — that peculiarly messianic vision which sees mankind shepherded into a strait-jacket vesting in their hands "sole sovereign sway and masterdom" over the whole range of the world's economic activity. Should the day — Heaven forbid — ever arrive that such unscrupulous and malign operators fulfil their monopolistic ambitions, the superficially antagonistic relationship between capitalists and communists will be exposed as the biggest canard in human history.

UNCLE SAM'S SHAM FIGHT. — Our American colleague Don Bell was being his usual percipient self when he remarked in a recent issue of his newsletter *Don Bell Reports* that the Democrat and Republican Party Conventions were "spectacular and impressive circuses" where "party delegates meet to applaud selected speakers, to approve selected pre-written planks for pre-constructed platforms that will soon be forgotten, and to vote for pre-selected nominees who are chosen not on the basis of their character, integrity and loyalty to God and Country; but . . . on the basis of their popularity, vote-getting ability and loyalty to Party and special interests." How true are such words, too, if applied to our recent two-and-a-bit seaside farces staged by the Lib-Lab-Con-men!

Just about everything involving the U.S. Presidential election (which, hopefully, should be over and banished from the daily news by the time these words are published) strikes me as being meaningless and trivial, except perhaps for the mild entertainment value provided by the sight of the contestants cringing and crawling before, Jews, Blacks, Jews, Mexicans, Jews and any other minority

interest in order to ingratiate themselves and thereby secure their block votes. There is value, too, in using the contest for an insight into the process of brain-washing a gullible electorate. One might think differently of the Republican and Democrat candidates, wrote Don Bell, if "one party were known to be controlled by the Trilateral Commissioners and the other party were free of such control." But any such distinction is lost when we realise that while "Sissy" Carter has some eighteen fellow-Trilateralists on his staff and while loner John Anderson is himself a charter member, Ronald Reagan has on his team George Bush, David Packard, Caspar Weinberger (how could *anyone* stand living with a name like that?) and Anne Armstrong, with the sinister Dr. Kissinger lurking in the shadows.

Personally, I do not care two hoots who gets into the White House, and any American who expects in his national leader the virtues of character, integrity, honesty and patriotism will have no favourites either amongst the political-pygmies on offer. The vast power of patronage wielded by the finance-houses of Wall Street means that Carter, Reagan and Anderson are all their agents, and while plenty of space exists within the bounds of political minutiae for them to manoeuvre against each other, on cardinal issues they can be relied upon not to deviate from the guidelines their masters have set down. For just imagine the storm that would ensue were one of them to break the unwritten rules of the democratic game and announce their intention of opposing Communism by halting the massive financial, technological and military aid to the Soviet Union, cited previously in this column, for good.

KOSHER TO THE CORE. — A significant force in the campaign to secure Ronald Reagan's election, I am interested to see, is what is known as the 'neo-conservative' or 'new right' movement, which has been described by the top New York magazine *Esquire* as "the most powerful new political force in America". Lest any reader doubts my scepticism that Reagan might just be prepared to offer battle on real instead of fabricated issues, it is worth re-iterating the point made in *Spearhead* by Dr. William Pearce last April — namely, that this 'conservative' movement is, in fact, very heavily influenced by Jews exhibiting an unabashed belief in *laissez-faire* capitalism, Social Darwinism and anti-Russian jingoism (the last in order to secure entry visas to the States for massive numbers of Soviet Zionist Jews). They possess several advantages over the traditional, populist type of American right-winger in that they are sharper, more wealthy and receive sympathetic treatment from the controlled media.

Their leading lights include Irving Kristol, whose vision of aggressive corporate capitalism so appeals to the *Wall Street Journal* that it has employed him as a regular columnist, Nathan Glazer, William Simon and a number of other eastern cosmopolitan intellectuals who were either Marxists in the 'thirties, cold war liberals in the 'fifties or Johnsonian Democrats in the 'sixties — in short, followers of whatever was the prevailing wind at the time. Another is an assertive character by the name of Edward Luttwak, who is believed to have been the author in 1975 of a paper urging a joint U.S.-Israeli invasion of Saudi-Arabia.

The clarion call of this kosher-conservative movement is 'freedom'. Not, however, freedom for the United States to survive as a nation, but the kind of odious economic 'freedom' which, in direct descent from the liberal Manchester school of *laissez-faire*, constitutes a complete sell-out to the market-place. The free-market philosophy of the nineteenth-century left its monument in the dreadful conditions suffered by the labouring poor The gathering pressure in Amercia — and here under Margaret Thatcher's mis-government — for a return to an economic free-for-all conducted without regard for the national being can only lead to an environment in which capitalist firms wage all-out warfare against other capitalist concerns, ostensibly to provide free competition but more often than not to take them over in their bid for monopoly. If Ronald Reagan can campaign so enthusiastically for the regulation of social life in the form of police to guard streets and homes against criminal activities, is it not somewhat inconsistent for him to follow the advice of a tribe of financial hucksters in advocating an *un*regulated economic system in which the amok-runs of conflicting interests prepared to tear the nation apart in their drive for power and money are accepted as perfectly normal?

THAT'S DEMOCRACY! — While agreeing that Iranians found guilty of assault, especially on the Police, should be deported, an editorial in *The Times* argued the case for leniency in dealing with those poor souls who had merely "lost their heads" in the excitement of their demonstrations! "What he [the Home Secretary] must *not* do is to deport Iranians solely because it is the clear public wish that we should be rid of them." We must be grateful, I suppose, that Mr. Rees-Mogg has at least recognised the fact that people are sick to death of alien rabble using the streets to create disorder, even if he cannot bring himself to cast spurious moral superiority aside and use his editorial pen to urge the Government to boot from our land the lot of them.

THE A. K, CHESTERTON TRUST

Very many of you have contributed to the A. K. Chesterton Trust and by so doing have helped to keep *Candour* in being. In a legal declaration the objects of this Trust are stated as follows: "To promote and expound the principles of the late Arthur Kenneth Chesterton which are defined as being to demonstrate the power of and to combat the power of International Finance and to promote the National Sovereignty of the British World."

In these times of soaring postage and printing costs, please continue to support the Trust with whatever donations you can spare.

Making Your Will ?

Most readers have a stake in the future in the form of children and grandchildren who, if *Candour* and similar publications, fail to alert the nation, will exist as slaves under the diabolical World Government that is planned for the destruction of *all* nations.

So when making your will, please remember the AK.C. Trust. A legacy from you will ensure the dissemination of the truth to which A.K. devoted his life. Truth is the *only* power that will keep your descendants and your country free.

The A.K. Chesterton Trust,
Forest House, Liss Forest,
Hampshire GU33 7DD.

Mentioning the unmentionable

Catholic bishops in Germany have been attacked by the Social Democratic Party for objecting strongly in a pastoral letter to the "dangerously high national debt" that has been built up on recent years. We wonder if there would have been a similarly hostile reaction had the Church said Germany's debt was not half large enough or had it espoused the cause of the 'exploited" poor. A *Times* editorial claimed to see a difference between speaking out on social issues and on the national debt. In that-newspaper's view, presumably, here is one Christian principle which should *not* underline politicians' actions. For clerics who deliberate on the evils of usury, it is a case of "Get back to your chancels!"

Turn out Your Attics !

Candour Research Department is anxious to build up its reference library of pre- and post-war British nationalist literature. Any readers with attics to clear are requested to write to Robert Blake at Forest House.

DYNAMIC INVERSIONS

Monopoly is just a game
To pass the time away,
Or a title to defame
And so usurp the winning play.

Financial wolves want every prize
And not content with property,
Man's very soul monopolise
To ultimate authority.

Nothing sacred shall remain
To thwart Big Brother's charity;
The ethnic cult is split in twain,
Government a parity.

Telephones and Royal Mail
Are treated to the smear,
The cap is made to fit the tail
And mourners made to cheer.

Like a 'Learner' upside-down
A logo is devised
To point the way for 'Telecomm'
To fragment and be chastised.

The Army has monopoly
The Income Tax as well
And yesterday the E.E.C.
Endorsed the right to swell!

Scrabble for a spell can share
The search for words to sit
So that the tricky cross-over
Leaves fools with no profit.

An Empire, or a service,
Too social might display
A very sudden death-kiss
To the money-barons sway.

Monopoly is having
All ways the right to choose
The 'heads' to say you're winning
And 'tails' that others lose.

B. E. BIGGS.

STEVEN BOOKS

The Camp of the Saints, £2.50
Iron Curtain Over America, £3
Murder of Lawrence of Arabia, £7
Imperium. £4

Send orders and requests for a full list to:
S. B., P. O. Box 112, London N22 6AW

REFLECTIONS ON RHODESIA

by ' BRITISH VOLUNTEER '

Up to September 1979, the security situation within Rhodesia, in my opinion, deteriorated steadily and would have become serious if the terrorists had been anything other than negroes. The reasons for the deterioration were:

- A steady increase in the number of terrorists within Rhodesia.
- Wholesale abandonment of European farms in certain areas, e.g. Umtali. However, in other areas virtually no European farms were abandoned, as at Mt. Darwin and Centenary.
- The tremendous size of some of the terrorist camps within Mozambique and Zambia which meant that we (the Rhodesian Security Forces) could not attack them effectively.
- A shortage of Hunter and Canberra aircraft — particularly the latter.

However, the situation changed dramatically for the better in September of last year when we started to attack the economies of Zambia and Mozambique — something which shou'd have been done ten years before. The first attack was a large raid lasting several days into the Gaza province of Mozambique. The main objectives of this raid were to destroy most of the bridges on the railway line from Lourenco Marques (Maputo) to the Rhodesian border at Malvernia and to mine the road network, such as it is, in the Gaza province. The following month, the Zambian communications system was attacked and all the bridges connecting Zambia with the outside world were destroyed with the exception of those connecting the country with Rhodesia. This work was done over a period by small groups of S.A.S. men. At the time of the ceasefire, plans were in hand to immobilise the railway line from Umtali to Beira.

Before I left Rhodesia, I was told on good authority that these attacks, even though those against Mozambique were not completed, had done so much damage to Zambia and Mozambique that neither country could afford to continue to support terrorists and were ready to come to terms with Rhodesia. Deprived of external support, the terrorists within Rhodesia would soon have ceased to be a danger. It may well have been that the war was already won when the ceasefire came into force.

Rhodesia also put pressure on Mozambique by supporting the activities of the forces of the anti-Frelimo group known as the R.N.M. (Resistencia Nacional de Mozambique). I have no knowledge when this support started, but I do know that my Squadron began dropping supplies to the R.N.M. in October 1979. These drops were made at frequent intervals to a number of locations. The R.N.M. bands were led by Rhodesian S.A.S. so that one can safely say that they would not have been idle.

Rhodesia's Russian Tanks

In the last few months of the war, our equipment increased enormously in both quality and quantity. The Army seemed to lack for nothing and even acquired some Russian tanks, although these were never used operationally. The Air Force had available large numbers of the small Alouette helicopters which were the aircraft most widely used by the 'Fire Forces' that operated against terrorists within Rhodesia. Moreover, towards the end of 1978 the Air Force had acquired a small number of the rather larger Bell 205 helicopters and these aircraft enormously increased our capability to strike deep into Mozambique and Zambia In fact, the operations referred to above — particularly those within Zambia — would not have been possible without them. The Air Force also acquired some air-to-air missiles which were fitted to the Hunters, but these were never fired in anger.

Amongst the conditions of the ceasefire which were supposed to be observed by the terrorists were that all terrorists within Rhodesia should proceed directly to Assembly Areas and that no further terrorists should enter Rhodesia. When the ceasefire commenced. I was serving with a Fire Force stationed at Grand Reef, near Umtali. On the eve of the ceasefire, a band of about 500 terrorists entered the country from Mozambique and occupied a Protected Village near the Honde Mission from which they refused to move, although they did say that they would go to an Assembly Area when they were ready to do so. As this was a clear breach of the ceasefire, we prepared to attack them. But the attack was never launched.

Following a brief conversation with a British Colonel in the Commonwealth Monitoring Force, who appeared at Grand Reef whilst we were standing by to attack, I was left in no doubt that the C.M.F. was quite prepared to tolerate breaches of the ceasefire provided that they were committed by the terrorists. Eventually,

this band left the P.V. and moved into an Assembly Area in their own good time without any interference from us.

During the nine weeks of the ceasefire, the C.M.F. made no attempt to prevent terrorists from leaving the Assembly Areas and moving freely amongst the surrounding villages where they were able, without let or hindrance, to intimidate the inhabitants into voting for either Nkomo or Mugabe. I once saw a report in a Sitrep. which gave an account of a group of terrorists being driven into a kraal in a C.M.F. vehicle, holding a meeting there and being driven away in the same vehicle. In view of the small number of C.M.F. troops at each Assembly Area, I can appreciate the difficulties that would have faced these men had they tried to prevent terrorists from moving in and out of the Assembly Areas at will. But what I cannot forgive are the lies told to us about the situation by their officers.

Normally, I tried to avoid contact with members of the C.M.F. but, on one occasion, I entertained a British Army Major with whom I had been slightly acquainted many years ago. During the course of the evening, I mentioned a report that I had heard of the capture by the Rhodesian Army of terrorists who were picked up outside Assembly Areas and were wearing boots issued by the C.M.F. He replied that this was not possible because the C.M.F. did not issue the "guerrillas" with boots. I then said that the terrorists may not have been issued with boots but they certainly had been issued with some kind of footwear by the C.M.F. My acquaintance had the grace to admit that this was possible. Towards the end of the ceasefire period, we so mistrusted the officers of the C.M.F. that we tried to mount anti-terrorist operations without their knowledge. Needless to say, these pathetic attempts met with little success.

Reasons For Surrender

Since my return to the United Kingdom, I have wondered a great deal about why the white Rhodesians allowed their country to be handed over to a bunch of Communist thugs in the wake of a rigged election. The pressures on them to do so can hardly be said to have been formidable. Their military position was improving fast (although few people knew this) and, anyway, the number of whites who were in physical danger because of the war, was very small. Moreover, their opponents—though bestial in the extreme—were cowardly and incompetent. Their economic position was also improving and they lacked for nothing essential. One must, of course, condemn the unspeakable behaviour of the British Government and Foreign Office. But this, on its own, would never have caused the take-over of Rhodesia by the Communists.

The hard fact is that the will of the white Rhodesians failed, and it failed because there was no leadership to sustain it. Much of the blame for this must be laid at the door of Ian Smith and the politicians of the Rhodesian Front. But some of it must also be attached to General Peter Walls. During the period of the ceasefire, he was the most powerful man in Rhodesia. He commanded the unswerving loyalty of the Rhodesian Security Forces who would have backed him in any move he chose to make to halt the Communist take-over. He failed utterly to rise to the challenge. Whether he was a knave or a fool deluded by the glory of his own image, I shall never know, but I incline to believe the latter. I understand that right up to the eve of the election he was assuring his subordinates that there was no possibility of a Z.A.N.U.(P.F.) victory. May we be preserved from soldiers who talk about the need for political solutions to military problems and forget that nobody ever lost a war against terrorists without first convincing themselves that they could never win it.

WE WARNED ABOUT SMITH . . . NEARLY 14 YEARS AGO!

The truth is that Smith, despite his popular image, is not even a Right-winger. He is, if anything, slightly left of Centre. He began his political career as a protegé of Roy Welensky and a Liberal he remains to this day. I do not doubt that in his secret heart he has the gravest misgiving about Black rule, but I am no less sure that in his mind he is convinced that it is inevitable. Indeed, he actually said so, if I am not mistaken, at a press conference held a week before the *Tiger* meeting. The most he can expect to do, therefore, is to soften the impact of Black rule on the White community. In this, we will doubtless have the backing of the big commercial and industrial interests in Salisbury and elsewhere. My advice to Rhodesian Fronters who believe that they have in their leader a staunch proponent of White rule is — however heart-breaking the process — to think again.

— A. K. Chesterton in *Candour*, February, 1967.

THE CASE FOR EVOLUTIONARY REVISIONISM

The theme of an address given by Marie Endean at the A.G.M. of the British Housewives' League in April, 1980.

The aims and activities of Community Standards Associations, so well described by Miss Sue Evelyn at the Annual General Meeting, could be admirably served by promoting a campaign to debunk the teaching of evolution as a fact in our schools, colleges and universities.

Has man descended from the monogamous gibbon or the promiscuous chimpanzee?(1) When the climate of opinion is such that an author can solemnly debate this question, surely the time has come for anti-evolutionists to call a halt to contemporary debasement of thought and word.

For far too long the evolutionists have held sway in our places of learning. Publishers of scientific journals, editors of both the lay and the religious press, lecturers, teachers, successful public figures have for decades feared to breathe a word fundamentally critical of evolution for fear of losing caste. In the words of a converted evolutionist and Fellow of the Zoological Society, Mr. Douglas Dewar, because the public has been permitted to hear only one side of the case, "the average man . . . is led to believe that evolution is a law of nature as firmly established as is the law of gravity."(2)

Thus in textbooks for schools we have vivid drawings of our ape-like "ancestors", such as Australopithecus, running upright in fine fur coats chasing wild animals with sticks and stones. On radio programmes we hear such categorical expressions as "before we lost our fur", or "the process of evolution had just invented the flowers." The presenter of a famous TV series even described the feather as being "the individual creation of the birds." Who are we to quibble when such sloppy thinking is presented by "experts" speaking with all the authority of the media?

We can and we must. We have every chance of winning the argument and the battle as is happening now in the USA where a "potent wave" of evolutionary revisionism is sweeping America. According to the *Daily Mail,* "In a astonishingly sophisticated campaign schools across the country are currently being pressured to revise their biology lessons, to include a biblical account of the origins of life." Aided by super-sales techniques, presentations, books and LPs, "creationism" draws on the Book of Genesis, biochemistry, the laws of thermodynamics, fossils, and mathematical probability to contend in as valid a way as Darwin's dialectics that it is simply impossible for a random process to account for human life as we know it today. Furthermore, this campaign is not the work of cranky bible-belt people but of "some high-powered academics" co-operating with parents and other concerned members of the public.(3)

When we dig deeper, we discover there really have existed, and do exist, experts in archaeology, botany, biology, gentics, geology and palaeontology and other scientific disciplines, who reject the Darwinian theory of organic evolution in general and of the origins of man in particular.

They have observed some very stubborn phenomena in natural science that refuse to fit in with the theory of evolution. Seaweeds were swilling about in the Cambrian seas 600 million years ago. The unhappy housewife who sees silverfish and cockroaches in her larder is beholding forms of life unchanged in 350 million years. The oldest known insects of geological records are so much like modern insects that palaeontology does not help evolutionists at all. The genus of the edible mussel lived as large as life 160 million years ago. Bats have scarcely changed. Nor have our wise old cats.

Just to add insult to injury, live specimens of the coelacanth, believed to have been extinct for 70 million years, have been caught off the coasts of Africa in 1938 and 1969. The pity of it all, and yet the faith of evolutionists has not been shaken!

Experts Reject Evolution

One of the distinguished anti-Darwinian scientists at the turn of the century was Albert Fleischmann, Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at the University of Erlangen in Germany. A scientist of European reputation, his testimony was all the more valuable because he was not a Christian but an agnostic. He attributed the persistence of the belief in evolution to "mankind's love of fairy tales."

Then there was Sir J. Ambrose Fleming, a Fellow of the Royal Society who flatly rejected the theory of evolution. Though he was the inventor of the thermionic valve making radio broadcasting possible, the BBC refused to give him an opportunity to state the case against evolution in his capacity as President of the Evolution Protest Movement.(4)

A short list of anti-evolutionist scientists must include Sir Charles Marston, one of the archaeologists who excavated Jericho; the German botanist Professor Johannes Reinke, and the Swedish botanist, Professor Heribert Nilsson; the French geologist,

Paul Lemoine, Past President of the Geological Society of France; and the palaeontologist, Lieut.-Col. L. Merson Davies, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, a Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Society and a Fellow of the Geological Society. Not names likely to be found in the encyclopaedias and popular journals.

Perhaps the most damning indictment of Darwinism's baleful effect on scientific integrity has come from the pen of the evolutionist, Professor W. H. Thompson, who wrote the introduction to the Everyman's Library edition of Darwin's Origin of Species published by Dent in 1956:

> "This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science."

Strong words indeed. Certainly the strangest things have happened in the evolutionists' efforts to find the missing link between man and his supposed simian lineal forebears: Java Man, Piltdown Man, Peking Man, the Heildelberg Jaw, even the Tooth of Hesperopithecus (5) have passed before us in sorry procession.

The one fact not paraded, however, is that none of these missing links could possibly have been the ancestors of man simply because Homo Sapiens was already in existence. Dr. Dubois, the discoverer of Java Man in 1894, had actually discovered two human fossil skulls of Australoid type in the same area in 1889 and 1890 — a fact he withheld from publication for thirty years. When in 1938 a chastened Dr. Dubois expressed the opinion that Java Man was really "a gigantic gibbon", the evolutionist pundits refused to accept his revised conclusion.

Evasion is the natural reaction of dedicated evolutionists to such finds. They push the search for man's common ancestor further and further into the past. In 1972 Mr. Richard Leakey's discovery in volcanic ash in Kenya of a human skull and a thigh bone "practically indistinguishable" from the bones of modern man led him to estimate, "very speculatively", that the missing link must have therefore lived between 5 and 10 million years ago.(6)

Aegyptopithecus, or "the connecting ape of Egypt", is the current missing link now being studied by a team from Duke University, North Carolina. With a flourish of trumpets we are told that these finds show "a vivid proof of Darwin's theory that man is descended from animals," the 30 million years age estimate of these fossils making them 15 times older than the oldest ancestor of man hitherto discovered.(7) Aegyptopithecus is proclaimed to have a cranial capacity of "about 30 cubic centimetres, larger for its body size than any of its contemporaries." However, there is a snag: the largest existing ape has a cranial capacity of 625 cc! A clear case of the child being father of the man! It seems that the cranial capacity of fossil skulls is not the only thing that needs examining.

The Marxist Connection

While it would be untrue to say that evolutionists are generally materialists, atheists and Marxists, it is almost invariably true that materialists, atheists and Marxists are evolutionists. From the beginning the popularity of Darwinism owed much to backing from non-scientists and indeed from sinister sources.

Karl Marx was one of the first political theorists to grasp the far-ranging implications of Darwin's theory. In a letter to Lassale he wrote:

> "Darwin's volume is very important and provides me with the basis in natural science for the class struggle in history."(8)

In fact, so highly did Marx think of Darwin that he wished to dedicate **Das Kapital** to him in 1867 — a request that was politely refused. It is not surprising therefore to learn that compulsory classes on Darwinism were given in Russian POW camps during the last war; or that in 1959 the USSR struck a special medal in honour of the centenary of the publication of the **Origin of Species;** or that there is a fine Darwin Museum in Moscow. In fact, Darwinism is the official scientific teaching throughout the Soviets and also in Red China.(9)

So the de Christianising influence of Darwinism is powerfully reinforced everywhere by Communist vester interest in keeping it as the "scientific" back-up for political ends and for shoring up belief in the inevitability of the class struggle. Once people realise this and know how flimsy are the scientific pretensions of evolution, they can exert real pressure, individually and through Community Standards Associations, to reverse falling standards of every kind. Put evolution into its proper place as the shakiest of hypotheses and interest in the basis of morality will be restored. Values will again be meaningful. Young people will be able at least to consider the idea of a First Cause without being sniggered and laughed at. Brutish behaviour will then be seen to be brutish — not natural for mankind.

A valiant anti-evolutionist champion must have the last word:

"Whether we seek our ancestors in the Garden of Eden or the monkey-house, it is faith that guides us equally to the one quarter or the other: upwards to the stars and immortal harmonies beyond this muddy vesture of decay; or downwards to the dark earth and the beasts of the field that perish."([10])

In this struggle to reassert the "creationist" view of Man's origin nothing less than the moral health and sanity of the nation is at stake.

Footnotes

1. See *Sunday Times* review of a recently published sex book, 4th May, 1980.
2. In his book, *Man, A Special Creation,* pp.103-44.
3. "Revival of Adam" by Paul Dacre in his *America Column,* 9th April, 1980.
4. About the same time in 1934 the B.B.C. defended a Communist broadcast on the ground that "there was no greater danger than that a point of view should be suppressed"!
5. Actually a peccary's tooth. "This little tooth speaks volumes of truth" commented the then-president of the American Museum of Natural History!
6. *Daily Telegraph,* 10th November, 1972.
7. *Daily Telegraph,* 9th February, 1980.
8. *Selected Correspondence* published in London in 1934, p.135.
9. The *Daily Telegraph* reviewed the situation in Red China on 8th May, 1973.
10. *The Evolution Hoax Exposed* by A. N. Field, Tan Books, Illinois, p.68.

THE EVOLUTION HOAX EXPOSED

by A. N. FIELD

In exposing the supposed evidence supporting the theory of evolution, the author gives extensive scientific proof that species reproduced themselves exactly for as long as we have evidence of their existence and proceeds to consider the errors and abuses to which evolutionism has led in the scientific, philosophical, theological and social spheres.

Available from Candour Publishing Company.

Price: £2, including postage.

BOMBARDIER BEETLE EXPLODES EVOLUTION MYTH

by DR. DUANE GISH

In 1961, the German chemist, Professor Schildknecht undertook an investigation of the Bombardier Beetle *(Brachinus).* He found that the Bombardier Beetle has two glands which produce a liquid mixture, two connected storage chambers, two combustion chambers and two external tubes which can be aimed like flexible guns in the tail of a bomber.

When analysed, the stored liquid was found to contain ten per cent hydroquinone and twenty-three per cent hydrogen peroxide. Now, this is an explosive-reaction mixture. If you or I went into the laboratory and mixed these two chemicals, the mixture would explode in our faces. But the Bombardier Beetle adds an inhibitor which prevents the explosion. And then, when an enemy approaches him, he spirts this solution into the twin combustion tubes and — just at the right moment — he adds an anti-inhibitor, and Boom! It explodes in the face of his enemy.

Well now, let's try to imagine how the Bombardier Beetle worked this out by evolution. Let's think about that. Let's assume that millions of years ago, there was this little beetle. Let's call him Beetle Bailey. And one day, his Mum and Dad gave him a chemistry set for his birthday. And so, down in his basement laboratory, he was experimenting. He mixed a solution of hydroquinone and hydrogen peroxide — and Boom! He blew himself up and was scattered all around the walls of the laboratory and that was the end of Beetle Bailey.

Well, for hundreds of generations, thousands of generations, several tens of thousands of years, these little beetles were mixing up hydrogen peroxide and hydroquinone and blowing themselves up. Boom! Boom! Boom! Boom! For thousands of generations.

The Inhibitor

Then, for some strange reason, one of them invented the inhibitor. You see, he didn't *need* the inhibitor until he mixed up the chemicals. When he mixed up the chemicals, he blew himself up. So he could not pass the information down to his offspring because he did not have any offspring. So, there's no way to pass down this information. But let's assume he invents the inhibitor.

Now is not this a tremendous evolutionary success? Triumph? No. Not quite. Because now he has just got the two chemicals and the inhibitor. And he stores them. He's got to have a storage chamber, too. And I don't know how *that* came about. But anyhow, let's assume it did. He's got it, and he mixes up his chemicals and what do they do? They don't do anything. The mixture just sits there and corrodes his innards. And for thousands of more generations, then, the beetles are mixing up these chemicals and the inhibitor and storing them and corroding their innards. And all of this goes on for thousands of generations.

Now he did not need an anti-inhibitor until he had an inhibitor. And he didn't need the inhibitor until he had the chemicals. But, let's assume that one of these little beetles invents an *anti*-inhibitor. Tremendous evolutionary triumph? No. Completely fatal. You see, all he's got is the storage chambers. He mixes up the chemicals, adds the inhibitor, then the anti-inhibitor — and Boom! Gone again! So Boom! Boom! Boom! For thousands of generations he blew himself up again.

You see, he must have combustion chambers. But he does not *need* the combustion chambers *until* he's got the two chemicals, the inhibitor and the anti-inhibitor. So, why would he have invented the combustion chamber — except by hind-sight?

Well somehow, for some reason, it finally came about, let us say. Now, here we are. All set. We have the two chemicals, the storage chambers, the inhibitor, the anti-inhibitor, and the combustion chambers. We're all set.

No. Not quite. You see, the beetle has got to have everything *timed* right. He has to have the right communication network.

Can't you imagine how embarrassing it would be? He's got that chemical and he squirts it into the combustion chambers and his friend comes up and pats him on the back and says: "Hi, Joe, how are you?" And — Boom! Goes off in his *friend's* face!

No. He's got to know just *when* to send the signal. He's got to have a communication network. He's got to know when he's *threatened,* he's got to know who is an enemy and who is not. *And he's got to have everything complete from the start. Complete — from the start.*

Dr. Duane Gish earned his B.Sc. in Chemistry from the University of California at Los Angeles and his Ph.D. in Biochemistry from the University of California at Berkeley. He has held appointments at Berkeley and Cornell University and spent eleven years in biochemical and biomedical research at the Upjohn Company. He is author of numerous scientific papers and books on scientific creationism.

The above anecdote was told by him in many of his lectures during a visit to Britain three years ago. The non-evolution of the Bombardier Beetle is much more than a bit of satire — it proves this beetle could not have evolved through continuous generations, over millions of years by chance, natural processes. It must have been created with this remarkable defence system, for such a complex system could not have evolved, as outlined above. Thus, the case of the Bombardier Beetle helps explode the evolution myth.

HOW NORMAL IS NORMAL?

An Australian reader has sent us a film review, bearing this heading, from the Melbourne *Age* of 5th June. It concerns a French film called *La Cage Aux Folles* which, for all we know, may already be on the rounds here.

The story is set in a homosexual nightclub and centres on the two middle-aged queers who run it. They are Renato and Albin, the latter being the temperamental star of its transvestite floor-show.

They have been happily 'married' for twenty years despite the skeleton jangling around in Renato's closet. He once had a brief affair with a woman, and his son — the result of his 'aberration' — now wants to marry. "I raise my son for twenty years and a woman comes and steals him," pouts Renato. "Bitch!" Then when the son decides that Albin is an unsuitable 'mother' to be introduced to his future in-laws, wounded dignity and mis-understanding abound.

But it is not so much the film (revolting as its subject is) that we find debasing as the newspaper's review of it. For the creature responsible goes on to comment:) "In this refreshingly different comedy of manners it is the socially-accepted norm that appears ludicrous because of the inherent hypocrisy of its upholders (the parents of the bride). *The gay* [i.e. queer] *couple are more admirable because of their honesty and devotion to each other and to 'their' child."* If we were Australians, we would not know whether to break into this 'journalist's' office and, like the Roman citizens in the Forum, cry: "Seek — burn — kill — slay!" or simply to vomit.

SOCIALISM UNMASKED by A. N. FIELD

PART 2

OUT OF THE SOHO DUSTBIN

British Socialism—so far as there is anything British about Socialism—was born in Soho, London. And if you pick up any guide book you will learn that Soho, between Leicester Square and Oxford street, was for many years "almost entirely occupied by foreigners." A considerable percentage of these foreigners have always been agitators deported from their countries of origin for their countries' good.

In the autumn of 1880 "a few English members of the foreign Rose Street Club in Soho" set to work to propagate Socialism in England. The leader of the group was Mr. H. M. Hyndman, a wealthy man and a Cambridge University graduate, who had previously been working with Mazzini, the Italian revolutionary. Associated with him were a number of well-to-do people like himself, and a few old Chartists.

This was the beginning of what in 1884 became the Social Democratic Federation. In 1882 a band of "Christian Socialists" joined up, George Lansbury being among the number. Later came John Burns, Tom Mann, Annie Besant and Ben Tillett. Hyndman records that the movement soon developed, as he had hoped, into "a thorough-going revolutionary organisation."

The Marx family presently cut in the person of Eleanor Marx, daughter of Karl Marx, and her "husband" Professor Aveling. They brought along in tow an Austrian Anarchist, Andreas Scheu, in order to pep up the organisation. Then they split off with William Morris, the poet, and others, and started an opposition Socialist League, because Hyndman would not obey the orders of Engels, Karl Marx's partner. This began a feud that lasted until 1892 by which time the seceders appeared to have become scared of the Anarchists who had filled up their league, and came back again.

Hot on the heels of the Hyndman organisation came the Fabian Society. This was a West End upper crust affair from the first, and began, not in Soho, but in the more elevated atmosphere of Chelsea. Soho, however, presently took charge and has held control down to the present day, except for one brief rebellion.

The Fabian Society began with the visit to London of Thomas Davidson, a Scottish "philosopher" and violent freethinker, who had been running an ethical class for Russian Jews in New York, and had visions of founding a "Fellowship of the New Life" in London. On January 4 1884, at the lodgings of Mr. E. R. Pease, a member of the London Stock Exchange, the group which had been sitting at the feet of Davidson formed themselves into the Fabian Society, the name being suggested by the spiritualist, Frank Podmore.

Cranks To The Fore

Membership of this society consisted from the first mainly of civil servants, journalists, and professional people. Its first tract, it is true, is said to have been written by W. L. Phillips, a house painter, but Mr. Pease in his Fabian history says Mr. Phillips was the sole representative of the working classes in the organisation. Prominent among early members was the wife of a successful architect; a Mr. and Mrs. Glide Stapleton, who drove to the meetings in their own brougham; and Mrs. Charlotte Wilson, wife of a stockbroker living at Hampstead, who later dropped Socialism to take up Anarchism along with Prince Kropotkin and ran the Anarchists' newspaper for them. The dominant forces in the organisation entered in the persons of Mr. Bernard Shaw, then a young journalist, and Mr. Sidney Webb, then a clerk in the Colonial Office.

The Fabian Society from the start adopted a system of propagating Socialism by wire-pulling from behind the scenes. It began this work by modestly getting up debates in Workmen's Clubs, etc., and thus embarked on its extensive and successful programme of insinuating Socialism into every sort of organisation — and usually without calling it Socialism. The actual membership of the society has never been large, but it has been, and still is, a most influential and sinister body. The London "Evening Standard" of November 1 1930, said many Labour members were then talking of the way the Fabian Society dominated the Ramsay MacDonald Labour Government of that time. Many people thought the Society was dead, but actually it was small but influential, with 5000 members, said the "Evening Standard", adding:

"Yet practically every recent appointment, either to high or low office, in the Labour Administration has been made from the membership of the Society, the latest examples of which are the new Air Minister, Lord Amulree, and the new Solicitor-General, Sir Stafford Cripps. I am told that at least 90 per cent of the members of the Government are in the rolls of the Society, and that contrary to regulations, so

are a good many highly-placed Civil Servants. . . This ascendancy is of course due to the all-powerful influence of Lord Passfield and his wife, Mrs. Sidney Webb, with whom the Fabian Society has been the passion of their lives."

The Fabian Society worked for years with drawing-room meetings in the West End. At the same time it began "permeating" the British Liberal Party and having its candidates stand as Liberals (all Fabians being pledged to Socialism); and it set to work on the local bodies pushing in candidates and never minding what they were called so long as they went in to get through Socialistic measures.

Permeation of Oxford and Cambridge Universities was begun at an early date, and by 1912 this was so far advanced that Mr. Clifford Allen (now Lord Allen of Hurtwood) of the Cambridge Fabian Society was able to launch the University Socialist Federation. In the Great War, Clifford Allen as related in the Examiner of September 1937 became the leader of the conscientious objectors, with funds estimated at half a million at his disposal for assisting those who wished to dodge military service on "conscientious" grounds. The seepage of Pink and Red ideas through the university colleges of New Zealand and the British Empire generally is testimony to the efficacy of the Fabian Society "permeation". The virus runs right through from the British Universities to primary school teachers in country towns in New Zealand.

An outstanding effort of the Fabian Society on the educational side was the founding of the London School of Economics in 1894 on the initiative, as usual of Mr. Sidney Webb. This later received a handsome endowment under the will of Sir Ernest Cassel, the Jewish international financier, founder of the Vickers armament combine and former partner with the late Jacob Schiff of Kuhn Loeb and Co, New York, who was mixed up both in the founding of the United States Federal Reserve system and the financing of the Russian revolution.

The late Lord Haldane, long friend of Mr. Webb's says he induced Sir Edward Cassel to give the money for this institution. Professor J. H. Morgan. K.C., in the"Quarterly Review" for January, 1929 says he once asked Lord Haldane why the endowment had been given, and Lord Haldane replied: "Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureacracy of the future Socialist State."

This London School of Economics is now attached to the University of London and is in receipt of a Government grant. In his book "The Alien Menace" (4th ed., 1933), Lieut. Col. A. H. Lane pointed out that about a third of its teachers at the time he wrote bore names of highly foreign flavour—De Paula, Eckhard, Laski Lauterpracht, Malinowski, Ginsberg, etc., etc. The school is notorious as a hive of Pink and Red propagandisism.

"The Firm Of Webb"

Mr. Sidney Webb, now Lord Passfield has been throughout the guiding spirit of the Fabian Society and chief Socialist wire-puller of the British Empire. A pamphlet "The Firm of Webb" (Boswell Press, London), gives from different sources interesting particulars about him. His appearance was thus described in the diary of his wife (then Miss Beatrice Potter) under date of February 14, 1890, as published in that lady's book, 'My Apprenticeship":

"Sidney Webb, the Socialist, dined here (Devonshire House Hotel). . . A remarkable little man with a huge head and a tiny body . . . A Jewish nose, prominent eyes and mouth, black hair, somewhat unkempt, spectacles and a most bourgeois black coat, shiny with wear. . . He is utterly disinterested."

"The Firm of Webb" states that Lord Passfield's birth certificate reveals that he was born at 41 Cranbourn Street, Soho, London in 1859, and that his father was one Charles Webb, a hairdresser. In 1859 there resided in Cranbourn Street—a street with less than fifty houses in it—persons named Balague, Klyberg, Lescochi,Paillard, Perocchy, Kuper, Deroy, Genese, Distin, Samorini, Kammerer, Felix, Delgarre and Gouriet (vide 1859 London Directory).

Adolphe Smith, interpreter at the First and Second Internationals is quoted as writing: "The Communists, on arriving in London, sought for lodgings . . . in the dingy streets between Soho Square and Leicester Square." If Mr. Webb's boyhood were passed in this locality his environment was not exactly 100 per cent British. "Who's Who" records that he was educated at "private schools, London; Switzerland Mecklinburg-Schwerin; Birbeck Institute; City of London College." Mr. Webb is said never to have illuminated his antecedents. It would appear to be unusual for an ordinary English hairdresser to educate his son in Switzerland and Germany.

In 1878 Sidney Webb became a clerk in the War Office, then Surveyor of Taxes, and after that a clerk in the Colonial Office until he left the Civil Service in 1891. During this time he wrote "Facts for Socialists" (Fabian Tract, No. 5), the most popular of the Fabian Society Tracts. The curious can find this tract dissected in Professor Hearnshaw's "Survey of Socialism."

"Of all the perpetual memorials of Fabian duplicity," says Professor Hearnshaw, "the notorious Tract No. 5 stands pre-eminent. It is an almost perfect model of the way in which authentic figures, drawn from reputable and authoritive sources, can be manipulated. . . to convey to ignorant and un-

critical minds pernicious and inflammatory falsehoods."

In 1822 Mr. Webb married Miss Beatrice Potter a lady who had been a pupil of Herbert Spencer and who had just written a book on the co-operative movement. Her father was a wealthy railway magnate who died on January 1 1892, leaving her a large fortune. This marriage, curiously, was one of the many pies in which Lord Haldane then Mr. R. B. Haldane, had a finger. Lord Haldane relates in his autobiography that the two had become attracted to each other but it was plain that Miss Potter's father would object to the engagement.

"By their desire," says Lord Haldane, "I went more than once to stay at her father's house. He was then an invalid, bed-ridden and dying. I went, and by arrangement asked that my friend Mr. Sidney Webb who happened to be lecturing near there on the Saturday night at Stroud, might also come for the weekend. The governess who was in charge thought that this was all right because she put me down as the fortunate young man. She was old, and when she found us in the schoolroom late at night, she thought it was as it should be and retired leaving us to put out the lights. I then said, 'I must have a walk on the common alone, otherwise I shall not be able to sleep, and I can't be away for less than an hour.' This I did, and came back and found the happy couple had had a conversation which they could not otherwise have had. Soon after that Mr. Potter, her father died. . . I never belonged to the Fabian Society but was always very much in contact with Sidney Webb and brought some of his ideas into the consultations which Asquith and Grey and I used to have on the future of Liberalism."

Lord Haldane's association with the intrigues preceding the Great War in 1914 is described in "All These Things."

With his domestic affairs thus happily provided for, Mr. Webb gained an untiring helpmeet. He and Mrs. Webb jointly wrote a history of trades unionism and they have sat on innumerable Royal Commissions, in drafting the reports of which they have played an important part. Mr. Webb on the London County Council was most active in promoting municipal socialism. The economic system imposed on Russia by the Bolsheviks is very much as advocated by Mr. Webb in 1888. In 1919 Mr. Webb on the Royal Commission on the Coal Mines put in a complete scheme of nationalisation. He was President of the Board of Trade in the first Labour Government and in 1929 he went to the House of Lords as Lord Passfield being the same time Secretary for the Dominions; his wife however insisting on remaining plain Mrs. Webb. As to whether Lord Passfield or Mrs. Webb is senior partner in the Firm of Webb, there is difference of opinion. Mr. Pease, secretary of the Fabian Society, said in his history that since 1912 Mrs. Webb had dominated it.

Artful Dodgers Sell Socialism

Mr. H. G. Wells, the Socialist novelist once tried to wrest the leadership of the Fabian Society from the Webbs who soon regained it. Mr. Wells later referred to Mr. Webb as an "incessant little intriguer". Mr. Wells said in the "Sunday Express' of December 11, 1927 that the Baileys in his novel "The New Machiavelli" were not the Webbs, "but only Webby people". In the novel one finds it written:

"I can still recall little Bailey, glib and winking, explaining that Democracy was really just a dodge for getting assent to the ordinances of the expert official by means of the polling booth."

Mr. H. G. Wells is also on record as saying of Fabian tactics of "permeation" that its leaders are "a very small group of pedants who believe that fair ends may be reached by foul means".

Engels himself, the partner of Marx, said of the Fabians in 1893: "Their tactics are to fight the Liberals not as decided opponents, but to drive them on to Socialistic consequences; therefore to trick them, to permeate Liberalism with Socialism, and not to oppose Socialistic candidates to Liberal ones, but to palm them off, to thrust them on, under some pretext . . . All is rotten."

"The Fabian Society," wrote Mr. Ellis Barker, "is the least open and least straightforward Socialist organisation . . . it habitually sails under a false flag, wishing not to arouse suspicion as to its objects . . . Fabians rely chiefly for their success upon their artfulness."

"This process of secret and gradual insinuation," said Dr. Beattie Crozier, "was, in effect, a real conspiracy"; and he called Mr. Webb the arch-conspirator and "sole High Pontiff of Fabian Socialism."

As to how Fabians actually set about propagating Socialism, the following example of Fabian work, written by Mr. Bernard Shaw and recounting an exploit of his own, is taken from the "History of the Fabian Society." Armed with a programme drawn up by Sidney Webb, and which it was desired to palm off on to the Liberal Party, Mr. Shaw set out. He relates:

"I being then a permeative Fabian on the St. Pancras Liberal and Radical Association (I had coolly walked in and demanded to be elected to the Association and Executive, which was done on the spot by the astonished Association — ten strong or thereabouts), took them down to a meeting in Percy

Hall, Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, where the late Mr. Beale, then Liberal candidate and subscription milch cow of the constituency (without a ghost of a chance) was to address as many of the ten as might turn up under the impression he was addressing a public meeting.

"There were certainly not twenty present, perhaps not ten. I asked him to move the resolutions. He said they looked complicated, and that if I would move them he would second them. I moved them, turning over Webb's pages by batches, and not reading most of them. Mr. Beale seconded. Passed unanimously.

"That night they went down to the 'Star' with a report of an admirable speech which Mr. Beale was supposed to have delivered. Next day he found the National Liberal Club in an uproar at the revolutionary break-away. But he p'ayed up . . . said we lived in progressive times and must move with them."

This incident is typical of the tricks and dodges by which British Liberalism was pushed along toward Socialistic policies.

Tricky Propaganda

Professor Hearnshaw points out that the essential dishonesty of the Fabians is their persistent and continuous representation of Collectivism as Socialism. They always represent such things as the Post Office and the State schools as examples of Socialism, and suggest that, having started, the nation may as well go the whole hog. At the same time they keep out of sight the real central fact that their Socialistic objective is the EXTINCTION of private enterprise. They keep on at this class of propaganda in spite of endless exposures.

"These men," says Professor Hearnshaw, "are not ignoramuses; they include some of the masters of the art and craft of letters, experts in the exact use of language. It is difficult, indeed, to acquit them of the charge of deliberate deception."

In 1935 Mr. and Mrs. Webb published a book of 1,143 pages in defence of Bolshevism. It was entitled "Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation". A section is devoted to "explaining" away the ruthlessness of Bolshevism, and the job is done in a truly slithery Fabian way. Here is a sample:

"No one can compute the sum of human suffering caused by this triple revolution over so vast an area, in so brief a time, amid the most embittered civil war, supported by half a dozen foreign armies actually invading Soviet territory.

"But equally no one can compute the sum of human suffering even unto the death, caused in England by the Protestant Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, and the triumph of democratic parliamentarianism, the whole drawn out over four centuries, with only the mildest of civil wars, and with next to no foreign wars."

This is the sort of dope by which Socialism has been propagated and by which Bolshevism is being whitewashed. Fabianism has taken the naked ugliness of the Marxian gospel of loot and slaughter and wrapped it up in a napkin to trade it off on the British people. The massacres of the Russian people by the Bolsheviks were part and parcel of their programme of terror. Their rule has throughout rested upon terrorism. But the Fabian adroitly waves away everything inconvenient.

In Bernard Shaw's account of his palming off of a Fabian policy on the St. Pancras Liberals printed above, the Fabian contempt for the people they were making use of appears very clearly. One looks in vain for a similar free and frank account in the Fabian official history of how Socialism was sold to Britain's trade unions by the Fabian Society. The Fabians were through with the Liberals when the book was written, but it was still advisable not to laugh too loudly over exploits in trades union quarters.

The story of the capture of the British Labour movement for Socialism has to be sought in other quarters. Of the part of "the Firm of Webb" therein, we have the statement of the Jew Laski of their London School of Economics: "Nor will anyone know until its archives are examined by a competent historian, how immense were their services in bringing the Labour Party to birth."

To be continued.

FROM OUR FAN MAIL

Sir or Madam — I acknowledge receipt of your publication Candour. Journalism of this type only arouses distaste in myself, and in the students at this University. The promulgation of doctrines that are both racist and racialist is particularly abhorrent.

I regret that I do not have time to make a detailed rebuttal of your arguements (*sic*). The most notable feature was the combination of apparently deliberate logical error with calculated distortions of fact, which I found most unpleasant.

I must request that you refrain from sending further obscene publications of this type.

— Mr. N. H. Weeks, Vice-President,
University of London Students' Union.

With pleasure! Regular readers who might have missed the "obscene" issue referred to are invited to apply to our Under-The-Counter Dept., who will despatch it to them in a plain sealed envelope —

R.de B.

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS.

Privileged Comment

The alleged murder of a White farmer by a member of Mugabe's Cabinet has drawn a lot of comment, not least from a choice publication called *West Indian World.* Expressing horror that the Black concerned might be hanged, its editorial opined that doubtless the execution would be carried out "by one of those sadistic White hangmen who achieved highly satisfying orgasms every time they released a trap-door". I can only assume that the failure of the authorities to proceed against such an inflamatory and obscene remark is indicative of the number of besotted negrophiles now occupying the Home Office, D.P.P.'s office and so on. For can you imagine a White writer getting away with such a comment about Blacks?

Harre-Brained

Vandalism is "British, male and necessary", according to Mr. Rom Harre (a researcher in social patterns and Fellow of Linacre College, Oxford) at a meeting of the British Association. The "only road to honour for disadvantaged Britons," he claimed, was to "smash things up". How else could one attain "status and reputation?" I wish *I* could land a cushy, lucrative job spouting such outright bilge . . . *and* find rooms-full of idiots willing to pay good money to sit and lap up every word I utter. With my inventive imagination, I'd be made for life!

Mis-Placed Priorities

The next time one of Christian Aid's dribbling cranks comes knocking on my door begging for donations, I shan't set the dog on him. Rather, I'll ask him how come the Indian Government, if it's so hard up, is considering introducing a colour TV service. In a country which boasts 375 million people living below the poverty line with a *per capita* income of less than £30 a year, I would think this is the *last* project on which scarce resources should be squandered. But if the idea goes ahead, I shall be fascinated to see just how anyone will actually be able to *watch* their new sets, since Calcutta, New Delhi and a load of other cities are stricken by frequent power-cuts during what would be peak viewing-time, while hundreds of millions of villagers in the rural heartland have not progressed beyond the use of mustard oil for power!

Rothschild Rumpus

A bout of verbal fisticuffs broke out publicly last month between members of the Rothschild clan when N. M. Rothschild, the merchant bank, took steps to change the name of Rothschild Investment Trust. The latter, it was claimed in the *Telegraph,* had no right to use such an "illustrious" name (I like that!), although R.I.T. argued it was an *asset* to their business. So wicked and so stupid is our world that they were probably right!

CANDOUR

U.K.	£3.50
Overseas airmail	£4.00
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

We wish all our readers

A Merry Christmas

and a Right New Year

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.